

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) based on *Konishi et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner submits that *Konishi et al.* teaches each of the features recited in the claims, including “a portion of the main chassis along a forward end thereof being cut out toward the rotatable head cylinder” as recited in claim 1. On the other hand, the Examiner attaches an annotated FIG. 1 from *Konishi et al.* In the annotated figure, the Examiner points to a dashed line as representing “a sub chassis cut out” (emphasis added).

Applicants note specifically that claim 1 recites a portion of the main chassis being cut out toward the rotatable head cylinder. Conversely, the Examiner’s annotated drawing refers to the cut out of the sub chassis.

Presuming the Examiner intended to refer to the cut out of the sub chassis, the Examiner may be correct that there is a cut out portion of the sub chassis. However, claim 1 refers to the portion of the main chassis including a cut out towards the rotatable head cylinder. For example, this feature is exemplified in FIG. 2 of the present application which illustrates a cut out 21e.

On the other hand, if the Examiner intended to refer to the dashed line in the annotated FIG. 1 of *Konishi et al.* as representing a cut out of the main chassis as recited in claim 1, applicants respectively disagree. FIG. 3 of *Konishi et al.* illustrates the main chassis of the recording/reproduction apparatus by virtue of the sub-chassis being removed. (See, e.g., Column 2, lines 62-64). As is clearly shown in FIG. 3 of

Konishi et al., there is no cut out towards the rotatable head cylinder. Rather, the main chassis has a very rectangular shape. Consequently, *Konishi et al.* does not enjoy the advantages associated with the present invention. (See, e.g., Spec., page 25, lines 4-17).

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that *Konishi et al.* does not teach or suggest “a portion of the main chassis along a forward end thereof being cut out toward the rotatable head cylinder” as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and claims 2-6 which depend therefrom.

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-6 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: October 10, 2006

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

yamap917amendmentnonfinal1.wpd